Atty Dkt No. 200-1576 (FMC 1649 PUS)

S/N: 10/064,894

Reply to Office Action of April 29, 2003

Remarks

In view of the amendments above and the following remarks, Applicants

respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, and 15 to more particularly

point out and distinctly claim the invention as including a plurality of "removable" control

portions, wherein each respective portion corresponds to a certain "hybrid electric vehicle

drive system" functionality. Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references cited by

the Examiner teach this limitation.

Objection To The Abstract

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to the Abstract obviates this

rejection. In particular, the Abstract has been amended to reflect the method claim as

requested by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection Of

Claims 1-10 Over Raffari

Independent claim 1 is the only independent claim which relates to this rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim "said

controller comprising a plurality of removable control portions, wherein each of said plurality

of portions corresponds to a certain hybrid vehicle drive system functionality." The Examiner,

at page 6 of the Office Action mailed on April 29, 2003, notes that Raffari "fails to specifically

disclose that said portions are removable." As such, Raffari fails to particularly teach each

element now recited in independent claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 2-10, which depend

from independent claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is

patentable.

Atty Dkt No. 200-1576 (FMC 1649 PUS)

S/N: 10/064,894

Reply to Office Action of April 29, 2003

any direct control of the drive system. As such, Beckert fails to provide any suggestion,

motivation, or incentive to teach a plurality of "removable" control portions, wherein each

respective portion corresponds to a certain "hybrid electric vehicle drive system" functionality,

as recited in independent claims 1, 11, and 15. Because Raffari fails to make up for this

deficiency, independent claims 1, 11, and 15, as well as the dependent claims which depend

therefrom, are non-obvious and patentable over the combination of Raffari and Beckert.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the

filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 06-1510 -- a duplicate of this paper is enclosed

for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

DEEPA RAMASWAMY

By

John R. Buser

Reg. No. 51,517

Attorney for Applicants

oh RoB_

Date: 8/22/2003

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351